

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of January 14, 2004 has been received and contents carefully reviewed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 7.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,008); and rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 and 15-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,008. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "irradiating the organic passivation layer with ultraviolet rays and making a reaction with ozonized oxygen to change the surface property of the organic passivation layer, thereby forming a hydrophilic buffer layer..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and claims 2, 4-6 and 8, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 9 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 9 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a hydrophilic buffer layer over said passivation layer, the buffer layer formed by irradiating the organic passivation layer with ultraviolet rays and making a reaction with ozonized oxygen..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9, and claims 10-20 which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

For the similar reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496 - 7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: April 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By  \_\_\_\_\_  
Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant